REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending in the present application. With entry of this amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 7 and 8 and cancels claims 4 and 5 without prejudice. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Amendments to Claims 1, 7 and 8

First, Applicant has amended the claims to recite that each choice corresponds to a value. Support for this amendment is found in the specification, for example, at page 8, lines 2-6. For example, in Fig. 2, BOX 10 corresponds to a value of "0" while BOX 11 corresponds to a value of "1."

Second, the claims recite "choice information" that indicates at which choice in a group the cursor should be displayed when the cursor is moved between groups. Applicant has amended the claims to recite storing choice information that corresponds "to a value shared by all of the plurality of groups." Support for this amendment is found in the specification, for example, page 9, line 24 to page 10, line 5. For example, as illustrated in Fig. 5A, a cursor buffer stores a cursor buffer value (listed at the bottom) that changes when the cursor is moved within a group. In the movement m1, the cursor buffer value in the cursor buffer changes from "0" corresponding to BOX 10 to "1" corresponding to BOX 11. The cursor buffer value is shared by all the groups as illustrated in Fig. 5A. That is, when the cursor moves to the next group, at movement m2, it goes to the choice BOX 21 because the cursor buffer value is "1." It does not go to the top item (BOX 20) or any other item based on what value a buffer could have stored for that group. Claims 4 and 5 have been correspondingly canceled.

Third, Applicant has amended the claim 1 to recite: "wherein, if the choice corresponding to the choice information does not exist in the second group, the cursor moving device moves the cursor to a choice in said second group corresponding to a value numerically closest to the value of the choice information." Claims 7 and 8 have been similarly amended. Support for this amendment is found in the specification and drawings, for example, at page 10, line 14 to page 11, line 17 and Fig. 4 at steps SA4, SA5 and SA7. For example, in Fig. 5B, the value in

the cursor buffer is "3" at BOX 33 after movement m11. When the cursor is instructed to move to the next group (BOX 2n), the cursor moves to BOX 22 which has a value "2" that is numerically closest to "3" as indicated by movement m12.

Fourth, Applicant has amended the preamble of claim 8 to recite that the program is embodied on a computer readable medium.

Rejection of Claims 1 and 3-8

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,434,626) in view of Hayashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,237,417). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hayashi '626 illustrates a menu screen 36b that is within the main screen 36a of a display in Fig. 4. The menu screen 36b displays a list of menu items as illustrated in Fig. 5. The user operates a remote controller to select one of the menu items in an up/down direction. For example, if item 36b2 relating to picture/sound quality is selected, a new menu is displayed in menu screen 36b corresponding to picture/sound quality. (Col. 9, lines 42-47.) If item 36b1 relating to sub-picture screen is selected, an additional submenu is displayed. In the previous response, Applicant noted that the submenu is displayed in menu screen 36b, but upon further review of Hayashi '626, it appears that the submenu is displayed in a separate screen 36c as illustrated in Figs. 4C and 6A. (See also Col. 9, lines 48-67.)

In either situation, Hayashi '626 is silent as to the placement of the cursor as it moves from the main menu to the submenu. Presumably, Hayashi '626 employs the conventional method of placing the cursor at the top of the submenu. In any event, there is no disclosure or suggestion of storing and employing choice information, as recited in claims 1, 7 and 8.

First, there is no disclosure or suggestion that the choice information corresponds to a value that is shared by all of the plurality of groups. The Examiner cites to memory 42 as storing parameter settings based on selections made by the user through the cursor. (See, e.g., Col. 9, lines 21-22 and Col. 10, lines 1-7 cited at page 4, last paragraph of the Office Action.) These settings can

be stored for subsequent occasions. The stored data, however, relates to the selected items for each menu and does not direct the placement of the cursor as it moves between menus.

Second, there is no disclosure or suggestion that if a choice corresponding to the choice information does not exist in the second group, the cursor moves to a choice in the second group corresponding to a value numerically closest to the value of the choice information. Indeed, Hayashi '626 employs a nested menu system in which a choice in the main menu corresponds to a choice in one of the submenus.

Hayashi '417 does not make up for the deficiencies of Hayashi '626. Hayashi '417 discloses a main screen area 15 and subsidiary screen area 16 as illustrated in Fig. 4. The subsidiary screen area 16 can display setting values, such as hue, saturation and the like, with corresponding level bars as illustrated in Fig. 4. Hayashi '417 discloses that the user can operate a remote controller to select one of the parameters and then adjust the level via the remote controller. Col. 5, lines 39-59 refer to "setting a cursor to a column corresponding to the chosen parameter" and using an adjust key 32 on the remote controller in Fig. 6 to adjust the parameter and the corresponding bars. Thus, it appears that the cursor simply moves between the headings of the columns (e.g., hue, saturation, etc.). There is no disclosure or suggestion of storing choice information corresponding to a value shared by all of the plurality of groups nor, if the choice corresponding to the choice information does not exist in the second group, moving the cursor to a choice in the second group corresponding to a value numerically closest to the value of the choice information.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 7 and 8 and dependent claims 3 and 6 are patentable over Hayashi '626 and Hayashi '417.

Rejection of Claim 2

Claim 2 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Hayashi '626, Hayashi '417 and Robertson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,183). The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 2, Applicant respectfully submits that Robertson does not make up for the deficiencies of Hayashi '626 and Hayashi '417 given that it was merely cited for storing information relating to the direction and distance of the movement of a cursor.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If, for any reason, the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 892-5630 to discuss any steps necessary to place the application in condition for allowance.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing Docket No. 393032041800.

Dated: January 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Mehran Arjomand
Registration No.: 48,231
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
555 West Fifth Street, Suite 3500
Los Angeles, California 90013
(213) 892-5200